28

TREVOR J. HATFIELD, ESQ Nevada Bar No. 7373 HATFIELD & ASSOCIATES, LTD. 703 S. Eighth Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: (702) 388-4469 Facsimile: (702) 386-9825 Email: thatfield@hatfieldlawassociates.com Attorneys for Plaintiff UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA 9 CASE NO: 2:18-cv-01805-GMN-NJK GINA GARCIA NAVARRETE, 10 Plaintiff, 11 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO EXTEND 12 VS. TIME FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS PURSUANT TO F.R.C.P. 4(M) 13 POLY-WEST, INC., et al., 14 Defendants. 15 COMES NOW, Plaintiff GINA GARCIA NAVARARETE, by and through her counsel, 16 the law firm of Hatfield & Associates, Ltd., and files this Motion to Extend Time for Service of 17 18 Process pursuant to F.R.C.P. 4(m). This motion is made and based upon the pleadings and 19 papers on file herein, the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities and the Declaration of 20 counsel. 21 Dated this 12th day of February 2019. HATFIELD & ASSOCIATES, LTD. 22 23 By: /s/ Trevor J. Hatfield Trevor J. Hatfield, Esq. (SBN 7373) 24 703 South Eighth Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 25 (702) 388-4469 Tel. Attorneys for Plaintiff 26 27

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I.

Plaintiff moves for an Order extending the time for service of the Complaint and Summons on Defendants, [ECF No. 1] based on F.R.C.P. 4(m). The docket entry upon Plaintiff filing her complaint noted that service was due on December 17, 2018. Plaintiff has good cause for the extension of the time period, and even absent good cause the Court has discretion to extend the time period. Out of an abundance of caution, Plaintiff requests an extension on both grounds. Plaintiff requests another sixty days' time to effect service.

Plaintiff has good cause for an extension of the time for service. Plaintiff is pro se. She mailed the summons and complaint but may not have complied with effecting service of process. Plaintiff's counsel was just retained and just noticed his appearance on February 11, 2019. Plaintiff anticipates serving Defendant within one week, but requests no later than sixty days' time from the deadline of service as set by the clerk of the court.

II.

Upon a plaintiff's failure to serve a complaint within 90 days, pursuant to FRCP 4(m), failure to serve does not automatically require dismissal, courts distinguish between justified delay or "good cause" and excusable neglect. *See, Lemoge v. U.S.* 587 F.3d 1188, 1198 (9th Cir. 2009).

Upon a showing of justified delay, the district court must grant a plaintiff an extension for "an appropriate period." *Id.* If good cause is not shown, the district court has the option of exercising its discretion by excusing the delay and issuing an order that directs that service be completed within a specified additional period of time. *Id.*

Pursuant to the *Lemoge* case, a plaintiff may be required to show excusable neglect, defendant's lack of prejudice, and plaintiff's severe prejudice if the complaint is dismissed. In

this case, Plaintiff will suffer severe prejudice if this case is dismissed, as this is an employment tort case and as the statute of limitations may have expired as to Plaintiff's 90-day deadline of 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-16(c). Plaintiff also has made a showing that the balance of equities in this case falls in favor of Plaintiff as any failure to comply with the rules of civil procedure stem from Plaintiff being incarcerated, and only having retained counsel within the past few months' time, *pro bono*. Most telling, however, is the lack of prejudice to Defendants.

Plaintiff and her counsel have not been dilatory in seeking to effectuate service; therefore, respectfully requests that the Court grant Plaintiff's motion.

Dated this 12th day of February 2019.

HATFIELD & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

By: <u>/s/Trevor J. Hatfield</u>
Trevor J. Hatfield, Esq. (SBN 7373)
703 South Eighth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
(702) 388-4469 Tel.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Nancy J. Koppe

United States Magistrate Judge

February 13, 2019
Date